

DERIVATIONS AND 2-LOCAL DERIVATIONS ON MATRIX ALGEBRAS OVER COMMUTATIVE ALGEBRAS

WENBO HUANG*, JIANKUI LI†, AND WENHUA QIAN‡

Abstract. We characterize derivations and 2-local derivations from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ is a unital $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule. We show that every derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is the sum of an inner derivation and a derivation induced by a derivation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{M}$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$ if $am = ma$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, we prove that every inner 2-local derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is an inner derivation. In addition, if $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative and commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, then every 2-local derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is a derivation.

Key words. derivation, inner derivation, inner 2-local derivation, 2-local derivation, matrix algebra

AMS subject classifications. 47B47, 47L30, 47L60.

1. Introduction. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ be an $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule. A linear map δ from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ is called a *derivation* if $\delta(ab) = \delta(a)b + a\delta(b)$ for each a, b in $\mathcal{A}$. Let m be an element in $\mathcal{M}$, the map $\delta_m : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, $a \rightarrow \delta_m(a) := ma - am$, is a derivation. A derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is said to be an *inner derivation* when it can be written in the form $\delta = \delta_m$ for some m in $\mathcal{M}$. An fundamental result, due to Sakai [31], states that every derivation on a von Neumann algebra is an inner derivation.

In 1990, Larson, Sourour [22] and Kadison [19] introduce the concept of local derivation independently. A linear map $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is called a *local derivation* if, for every a in $\mathcal{A}$ there exists a derivation δ (might depend on a) such that $\Delta(a) = \delta(a)$. It would be interesting to consider under which conditions local derivations automatically become derivations. Many partial results have been done in this problem. In [19] Kadison shows that every norm-continuous local derivation from a von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{R}$ into a dual $\mathcal{R}$ -bimodule is a derivation. In [18], Johnson extends Kadison's result and shows that every local derivation from a C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}$ into any Banach $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule is a derivation.

*Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China. (huangwenbo2015@126.com).

†Corresponding author. Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China. (jianskui@yahoo.com).

‡Research Center for Operator Algebras, Department of Mathematics, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200062, China. (whqian86@163.com).

In 1997 Semrl [29] introduced 2-local derivations and 2-local automorphisms. A map $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ (not necessarily linear) is called a *2-local derivation* if, for every $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a derivation $D_{x,y} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $D_{x,y}(x) = \Delta(x)$ and $D_{x,y}(y) = \Delta(y)$. In particular, if, for every $x, y \in \mathcal{A}$, $D_{x,y}$ is an inner derivation, then we call Δ is an *inner 2-local derivation*. Local derivations and 2-local derivations have been investigated by many authors on different algebras and many results have been obtained in [2, 6, 9-11, 16-21, 23-26, 30, 31].

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a infinite-dimensional separable Hilbert space. In [29] Semrl shows that every 2-local derivation on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a derivation. In [20] Kim and Kim give a short proof of that every 2-local derivation on a finite-dimensional complex matrix algebra is a derivation. In [7] Ayupov and Kudaybergenov extend this result on an arbitrary von Neumann algebra.

An algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *regular* (in the sense of von Neumann) if for each a in $\mathcal{A}$ there exists b in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $a = aba$. Let $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices over a unital commutative regular algebra $\mathcal{A}$. In [10], Ayupov, Kudaybergenov and Alauadinov show that every 2-local derivation on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n \geq 2$, is a derivation. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital commutative ring and $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n \geq 2$, be the matrix ring of $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$. In [11], Ayupov and Arzikulov show that every inner 2-local derivation on $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, $n \geq 2$, is an inner derivation. If every Jordan derivation from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$ is an inner derivation, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital Banach algebra and $\mathcal{M}$ is a unital $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule. Recently, in [17], He, Li, An and Huang show that every 2-local derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ ($n \geq 3$) into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ is a derivation.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a von Neumann algebra. We denote $S(\mathcal{R})$ and $LS(\mathcal{R})$ respectively the algebras of all measurable and locally measurable operators affiliated with $\mathcal{R}$. For a faithful normal semi-finite trace τ on $\mathcal{R}$, we denote the algebra of all τ -measurable operators from $S(\mathcal{R})$ by $S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ (cf. [1]). If $\mathcal{R}$ is an abelian von Neumann algebra then it is $*$ -isomorphic to the algebra $L^\infty(\Omega) = L^\infty(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ of all (classes of equivalence of) essentially bounded measurable complex functions on a measurable space (Ω, Σ, μ) . In this case, is well known that $LS(\mathcal{R}) = S(\mathcal{R}) \cong L^0(\Omega)$, where $L^0(\Omega) = L^0(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is the algebra of all measurable complex functions on (Ω, Σ, μ) , and $L^0(\Omega)$ is a unital commutative regular algebra. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a finite von Neumann algebra of type I without abelian direct summands. In [10], Ayupov, Kudaybergenov and Alauadinov show that every 2-local derivation on the algebra $LS(\mathcal{R}) = S(\mathcal{R})$ is a derivation.

Throughout this paper, $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$ -bimodule with $1m = m1 = m$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}$, where 1 is the identity of $\mathcal{A}$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$ if $am = ma$ for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$. From now on, $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, for $n \geq 2$, will denote the algebra of all $n \times n$ matrices over $\mathcal{A}$ with the usual operations; E_{ij} , $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, the matrix units in $M_n(\mathbb{C})$; $x \otimes E_{ij}$, the matrix whose (i, j) -th entry is x and zero elsewhere. We use A_{ij} for the (i, j) -th entry of $A \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$. We denote

$\text{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ or $\text{diag}(x_i)$ the diagonal matrix with entries $x_i \in \mathcal{A}$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, in the diagonal positions.

Let $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a derivation. Setting

$$\bar{\delta}((a_{ij})) = (\delta(a_{ij})), \quad (1.1)$$

we obtain a well-defined linear operator from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$, where $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ has a natural structure of $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ -bimodule. Moreover $\bar{\delta}$ is a derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ and its restriction onto the center of the algebra $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ coincides with the given δ .

In this paper we give characterizations of derivations, inner 2-local derivations and 2-local derivations from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$. In Section 2, we show that a derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, can be decomposed as a sum of an inner derivation and a derivation induced by a derivation from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{M}$ as (1.1), as follows:

$$D = D_B + \bar{\delta}.$$

In addition, the representation of the above form is unique if and only if $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$.

In Section 3, we consider inner 2-local derivations and 2-local derivations from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$. For the case that $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, we obtain that every inner 2-local derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ is an inner derivation. In addition, if $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative, then every 2-local derivation $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is a derivation.

2. Derivations of matrix algebras. In this section we look at a derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$. Firstly, we define $D_{rs}^{ij} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ by

$$D_{rs}^{ij}(a) = [D(a \otimes E_{rs})]_{ij}, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}, \quad i, j, r, s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

For any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{rs}^{ij}(ab) &= [D(ab \otimes E_{rs})]_{ij} \\ &= [D((a \otimes E_{rm})(b \otimes E_{ms}))]_{ij} \\ &= [D(a \otimes E_{rm})(b \otimes E_{ms})]_{ij} + [(a \otimes E_{rm})D(b \otimes E_{ms})]_{ij} \\ &= \delta_{js}[D(a \otimes E_{rm})]_{im}b + \delta_{ir}a[D(b \otimes E_{ms})]_{mj}, \end{aligned}$$

where δ is the Kronecker's delta. It follows that

$$D_{rs}^{ij}(ab) = \delta_{js}[D(a \otimes E_{rm})]_{im}b + \delta_{ir}a[D(b \otimes E_{ms})]_{mj}. \quad (2.1)$$

By (2.1), we have that

$$D_{mm}^{mm}(ab) = D_{mm}^{mm}(a)b + aD_{mm}^{mm}(b), \quad m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Thus $D_{mm}^{mm} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ is a derivation. We abbreviate the derivation D_{mm}^{mm} by D^m .

THEOREM 2.1. *Every derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, can be represented as a sum*

$$D = D_B + \bar{\delta}, \quad (2.2)$$

where D_B is an inner derivation implemented by an element $B \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$, and $\bar{\delta}$ is the derivation of the form (1.1) induced by a derivation δ from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$. In addition, the representation of the above form is unique if and only if $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$.

Before the proof of Theorem 2.1, we first present the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.2. *For every $i, j, r, s, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ the following equalities hold:*

- (i) $D_{rs}^{ij} = 0$, $i \neq r$ and $j \neq s$,
- (ii) $D_{rj}^{ij}(a) = D_{rm}^{im}(a) = D_{rm}^{im}(1)a$, if $i \neq r$,
- (iii) $D_{is}^{ij}(a) = D_{ms}^{mi}(a) = aD_{ms}^{mj}(1)$, if $j \neq s$,
- (iv) $D_{jm}^{im}(1) = -D_{mi}^{mj}(1)$,
- (v) $D_{ij}^{ij}(a) = D_{im}^{im}(1)a - aD_{jm}^{jm}(1) + D^m(a)$.

Proof. It follows from (2.1) that, equalities (i), (ii) and (iii) hold obviously. We only need to show (iv) and (v).

(iv): In the case $i = j$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= [D(1 \otimes E_{ii})]_{ii} = [D((1 \otimes E_{im})(1 \otimes E_{mi}))]_{ii} \\ &= [D((1 \otimes E_{im})(1 \otimes E_{mi}))]_{ii} + [(1 \otimes E_{im})D((1 \otimes E_{mi}))]_{ii} \\ &= D_{im}^{im}(1) + D_{mi}^{mi}(1), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$D_{im}^{im}(1) = -D_{mi}^{mi}(1). \quad (2.3)$$

For the case $i \neq j$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D(0) = [D((1 \otimes E_{ii})(1 \otimes E_{jj}))]_{ij} \\ &= [D((1 \otimes E_{ii})(1 \otimes E_{jj}))]_{ij} + [(1 \otimes E_{ii})D((1 \otimes E_{jj}))]_{ij} \\ &= [D(1 \otimes E_{ii})]_{ij} + [D(1 \otimes E_{jj})]_{ij} \\ &= D_{ii}^{ij}(1) + D_{jj}^{ij}(1), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$D_{jj}^{ij}(1) = -D_{ii}^{ij}(1).$$

By (ii) , (iii) and (2.3), it follows that

$$D_{jm}^{im}(1) = -D_{mi}^{mj}(1).$$

(v): By (2.1), we have that

$$D_{ij}^{ij}(a) = D_{im}^{im}(1)a + D_{mj}^{mj}(a), \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$D_{ij}^{ij}(a) = D_{im}^{im}(a) + aD_{mj}^{mj}(1). \quad (2.5)$$

Taking $j = m$ in equality (2.4), we obtain that

$$D_{im}^{im}(a) = D_{im}^{im}(1)a + D^m(a). \quad (2.6)$$

By (2.3), (2.5) and (2.6), it follows that

$$D_{ij}^{ij}(a) = D_{im}^{im}(1)a - aD_{jm}^{jm}(1) + D^m(a).$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 2.1] Let (a_{rs}) be an arbitrary element in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ and D be a derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$. For any fixed $m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, by Lemma 2.2, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} [D((a_{rs}))]_{ij} &= \sum_{r,s=1}^n D_{rs}^{ij}(a_{rs}) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^n D_{rj}^{ij}(a_{rj}) + \sum_{s=1}^n D_{is}^{ij}(a_{is}) - D_{ij}^{ij}(a_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{r \neq i}^n D_{rj}^{ij}(a_{rj}) + \sum_{s \neq j}^n D_{is}^{ij}(a_{is}) + D_{ij}^{ij}(a_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{r \neq i}^n D_{rm}^{im}(1)a_{rj} + \sum_{s \neq j}^n a_{is}D_{ms}^{mj}(1) + D_{im}^{im}(1)a_{ij} - a_{ij}D_{jm}^{jm}(1) + D^m(a_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^n D_{im}^{im}(1)a_{rj} - \sum_{s=1}^n a_{is}D_{jm}^{sm}(1) + D^m(a_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n (D_{km}^{im}(1)a_{kj} - a_{ik}D_{jm}^{km}(1)) + D^m(a_{ij}) \\ &= [(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))(a_{rs}) - (a_{rs})(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))]_{ij} + [\overline{D^m}((a_{rs}))]_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$[D((a_{rs}))]_{ij} = [(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))(a_{rs}) - (a_{rs})(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))]_{ij} + [\overline{D^m}((a_{rs}))]_{ij}, \quad (2.7)$$

where $(D_{sm}^{rm}(1)) \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$, and $(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))_{rs} = D_{sm}^{rm}(1)$. By (2.7), we conclude that

$$D((a_{rs})) = [(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))(a_{rs}) - (a_{rs})(D_{sm}^{rm}(1))] + [\overline{D^m}((a_{rs}))].$$

We denote $B = (D_{sm}^{rm}(1))$, where $B_{rs} = D_{sm}^{rm}(1)$, and $\delta = D^m$. Then every derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, can be represented as a sum

$$D = D_B + \bar{\delta}.$$

In the following, we show that the representation of the above form is unique if and only if $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$.

Suppose that D_M is an inner derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ implemented by an element $M \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$, and $\bar{\zeta}$ is a derivation of the form (1.1) induced by a derivation ζ from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$, such that $D_M = \bar{\zeta}$. The first step is to establish the following.

Claim 1. If $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, then $D_M = \bar{\zeta} = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1 If $i \neq j$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have that

$$0 = \bar{\zeta}(E_{ij}) = D_M(E_{ij}) = ME_{ij} - E_{ij}M.$$

It follows that $M_{ji} = 0$. Thus M has a diagonal form, i.e. $M = \text{diag}(M_{kk})$. Suppose that $\bar{\zeta} \neq 0$, then there exists an element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\zeta(a) \neq 0$. Take $A = \text{diag}(a)$, then $\bar{\zeta}(A) \neq 0$. On the other hand,

$$\bar{\zeta}(A) = D_M(A) = \text{diag}(M_{kk})\text{diag}(a) - \text{diag}(a)\text{diag}(M_{kk}) = 0.$$

This is a contradiction. Thus $\bar{\zeta} = 0$.

Claim 2. If $\mathcal{A}$ does not commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, then there exist D_M and $\bar{\zeta}$, such that $D_M = \bar{\zeta} \neq 0$.

Proof of Claim 2 By assumption, we can take $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $ma \neq am$. We define a derivation $\zeta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ by $\zeta(x) = mx - xm$ for every x in $\mathcal{A}$. We denote $M = \text{diag}(m) \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$, then D_M is an inner derivation from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$. Obviously, $D_M = \bar{\zeta}$ and $\bar{\zeta}(\text{diag}(a)) \neq 0$. Thus $D_M = \bar{\zeta} \neq 0$.

It follows from Claims 1 and 2 that, the representation of (2.2) is unique if and only if $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$. The proof is complete. $\square$

REMARK 2.3. *Theorem 2.1 generalizes Theorem 3.12 of [8] and Lemma 2.2 of [1].*

3. 2-Local derivations on matrix algebras. Throughout this section, we always assume that $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ is a 2-local derivation.

LEMMA 3.1. *For every 2-local derivation $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, there exists a derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\Delta(E_{ij}) = D(E_{ij})$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In particular, if Δ is an inner 2-local derivation, then D is an inner derivation.*

Proof. We define two matrices S, T in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ by

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n i1 \otimes E_{ii}, \quad T = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} E_{ii+1}.$$

It is easy to see that an element $X \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$ commutes with S if and only if it is diagonal, and if an element $Y \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$ commutes with T , then Y is of the form

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 & y_2 & y_3 & \cdot & \cdot & y_n \\ 0 & y_1 & y_2 & \cdot & \cdot & y_{n-1} \\ 0 & 0 & y_1 & \cdot & \cdot & y_{n-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdot & y_1 & y_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdot & 0 & y_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By assumption, there exists a derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$\Delta(S) = D(S), \quad \Delta(T) = D(T).$$

Replacing Δ by $\Delta - D$ if necessary, we may assume that $\Delta(S) = \Delta(T) = 0$. Fixed $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we can take derivations Φ and Ψ from $M_n(\mathcal{A})$ into $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$\Delta(E_{ij}) = \Phi(E_{ij}), \quad \Delta(S) = \Phi(S),$$

and

$$\Delta(E_{ij}) = \Psi(E_{ij}), \quad \Delta(T) = \Psi(T).$$

By Theorem 2.1, Φ, Ψ can be represented as the form

$$\Phi = \Phi_X + \bar{\delta}, \quad \Psi = \Psi_Y + \bar{\xi},$$

where X, Y are elements in $M_n(\mathcal{M})$ and $\bar{\delta}, \bar{\xi}$ are derivations from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$. Since $0 = \Delta(S) = \Phi(S)$ and $\bar{\delta}(S) = 0$, it follows that

$$0 = \Phi_X(S) = XS - SX.$$

Therefore X has diagonal form, i.e. $X = \text{diag}(x_k)$. Since $0 = \Delta(T) = \Psi(T)$ and $\bar{\xi}(T) = 0$, it follows that

$$0 = \Psi_Y(T) = YT - TY.$$

Therefore Y is of the above form. On the one hand,

$$\Delta(E_{ij}) = XE_{ij} - E_{ij}X + \bar{\delta}(E_{ij}) = \text{diag}(x_k)E_{ij} - E_{ij}\text{diag}(x_k) = (x_i - x_j) \otimes E_{ij}.$$

On the other hand,

$$[\Delta(E_{ij})]_{ij} = [YE_{ij} - E_{ij}Y + \bar{\xi}(E_{ij})]_{ij} = [YE_{ij} - E_{ij}Y]_{ij} = 0.$$

It follows that $\Delta(E_{ij}) = 0$.

If Δ is an inner 2-local derivation, we can take derivations $\Phi = \Phi_X$ and $\Psi = \Psi_Y$. Similarly, we have that $\Delta(E_{ij}) = 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

The following theorem generalizes the main result of [11].

THEOREM 3.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$. Then every inner 2-local derivation $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is an inner derivation.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we may assume that $\Delta(E_{ij}) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For any $A \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$, we take a pair (j, i) , $j, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, by assumption, there exists an inner derivation D_B , such that $\Delta(A) = D_B(A)$ and $0 = \Delta(E_{ij}) = D_B(E_{ij})$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ij}\Delta(A)E_{ij} &= E_{ij}D_B(A)E_{ij} \\ &= D_B(E_{ij}AE_{ij}) - D_B(E_{ij})AE_{ij} - E_{ij}AD_B(E_{ij}) = D_B(E_{ij}AE_{ij}) \\ &= D_B(A_{ji} \otimes E_{ij}) = D_B(\text{diag}(A_{ji}, \dots, A_{ji})E_{ij}) \\ &= D_B(\text{diag}(A_{ji}, \dots, A_{ji}))E_{ij} + \text{diag}(A_{ji}, \dots, A_{ji})D_B(E_{ij}) \\ &= (B\text{diag}(A_{ji}, \dots, A_{ji}) - \text{diag}(A_{ji}, \dots, A_{ji})B)E_{ij} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$E_{ij}\Delta(A)E_{ij} = 0.$$

Therefore

$$E_{ji}(E_{ij}\Delta(A)E_{ij})E_{ji} = E_{jj}\Delta(A)E_{ii} = 0,$$

i.e.

$$[\Delta(A)]_{ji} = 0,$$

for every $j, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Hence $\Delta(A) = 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

In the proof of the following result, we use a similar technique as in [10] to give a generalization of Theorem 4.3 of [10].

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a commutative algebra which commutes with $\mathcal{M}$. Then every 2-local derivation $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$, $n \geq 2$, is a derivation. To prove this theorem, we need several lemmas. In Lemmas 3.4-3.9, we assume that $\Delta(E_{ij}) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

LEMMA 3.4. *For every $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$, there exist derivations $\delta_{ij} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, such that*

$$\Delta((a_{ij})) = (\delta_{ij}(a_{ij})). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Let $D_{A, E_{ji}} : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ be a derivation such that

$$\Delta(A) = D_{A, E_{ji}}(A), \quad \Delta(E_{ji}) = D_{A, E_{ji}}(E_{ji}).$$

By Theorem 2.1, $D_{A, E_{ji}} = D_B + \overline{\delta_{ij}}$, where D_B is an inner derivation implemented by an element $B \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$, and $\overline{\delta_{ij}}$ is the derivation of the form (1.1) generated by a derivation δ_{ij} from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have that

$$[\Delta((a_{ij}))]_{ij} = \delta_{ij}(a_{ij}).$$

Summing these equalities for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we have that

$$\Delta((a_{ij})) = (\delta_{ij}(a_{ij})).$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $X = \text{diag}(x_i)$ and $Y = \text{diag}(y_i)$ be arbitrary diagonal matrices in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. Then there exists a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that*

$$\Delta(X) = \text{diag}(\delta(x_i)), \quad \Delta(Y) = \text{diag}(\delta(y_i)). \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. By (3.1), we obtain

$$\Delta(X)_{ij} = \Delta(Y)_{ij} = 0, \quad i \neq j.$$

Take a derivation $D : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$\Delta(X) = D(X), \quad \Delta(Y) = D(Y).$$

By Theorem 2.1, there exist an element $B \in M_n(\mathcal{M})$ and a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, such that $D = D_B + \bar{\delta}$. Then

$$\Delta(X)_{ii} = D(X)_{ii} = D_B(X)_{ii} + \delta(x_i) = [BX - XB]_{ii} + \delta(x_i) = \delta(x_i)$$

and

$$\Delta(Y)_{ii} = D(Y)_{ii} = D_B(Y)_{ii} + \delta(y_i) = [BY - YB]_{ii} + \delta(y_i) = \delta(y_i).$$

Therefore

$$\Delta(X) = \text{diag}(\delta(x_i)), \quad \Delta(Y) = \text{diag}(\delta(y_i)).$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

LEMMA 3.6. *The restriction $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a derivation, where each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is identified with the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(a)$ in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$.*

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{A}$ is a commutative algebra which commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, to show that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a derivation, it suffices to show that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is additive.

Let $X = \text{diag}(x)$, $Y = \text{diag}(y)$ and $Z = X + Y = \text{diag}(x + y)$, for any $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, we take $W = \text{diag}(x, y, \dots, y)$. By Lemma 3.5, there exist derivations δ_1 , δ_2 and δ_3 from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{M}$, such that

$$\Delta(X) = \text{diag}(\delta_1(x)), \quad \Delta(W) = \text{diag}(\delta_1(x), \delta_1(y), \dots, \delta_1(y)),$$

$$\Delta(Y) = \text{diag}(\delta_2(y)), \quad \Delta(W) = \text{diag}(\delta_2(x), \delta_2(y), \dots, \delta_2(y))$$

and

$$\Delta(Z) = \text{diag}(\delta_3(x + y)), \quad \Delta(W) = \text{diag}(\delta_3(x), \delta_3(y), \dots, \delta_3(y)).$$

It follows that, $\delta_1(x) = \delta_3(x)$ and $\delta_2(y) = \delta_3(y)$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(X + Y) &= \text{diag}(\delta_3(x + y)) \\ &= \text{diag}(\delta_3(x)) + \text{diag}(\delta_3(y)) \\ &= \text{diag}(\delta_1(x)) + \text{diag}(\delta_2(y)) \\ &= \Delta(X) + \Delta(Y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is additive. The proof is complete. $\square$

Further in Lemmas 3.7-3.9, we assume that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$.

LEMMA 3.7. *Let $X = \text{diag}(x_i)$ be a diagonal matrix in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$, then*

$$\Delta(\text{diag}(x_i)) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Fix $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We take $Y = \text{diag}(x_k, \dots, x_k)$. By Lemma 3.5, there exists a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that

$$\Delta(X) = \text{diag}(\delta(x_i)), \quad \Delta(Y) = \text{diag}(\delta(x_k), \dots, \delta(x_k)).$$

Since $\Delta(Y) = 0$, it follows that $\delta(x_k) = 0$ for any fix $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, i.e. $\Delta(X) = 0$. The proof is complete. $\square$

LEMMA 3.8. *Let $X = (x_{ij})$ be an arbitrary element in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. Then $[\Delta(X)]_{kk} = 0$, for every $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

Proof. Fix $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Put $Y = \text{diag}(y_i)$, where $y_i = x_{kk} + i1$. By Theorem 2.1, we may choose a derivation $D = D_B + \bar{\delta}$, such that

$$\Delta(X) = D(X), \quad \Delta(Y) = D(Y).$$

By Lemma 3.7, we have that $\Delta(Y) = D(Y) = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = [\Delta(Y)]_{11} &= [D_B(Y)]_{11} + \delta(x_{kk} + 1) = [BY - YB]_{11} + \delta(x_{kk} + 1) \\ &= \delta(x_{kk}). \end{aligned}$$

If $i \neq j$, by assumption, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = [\Delta(Y)]_{ij} &= [D(Y)]_{ij} = [BY - YB]_{ij} + \delta(0) \\ &= B_{ij}(x_{kk} + j1) - (x_{kk} + i1)B_{ij} \\ &= (j - i)B_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, it follows that $B_{ij} = 0, i \neq j$. Thus B has a diagonal form, i.e.

$$B = \text{diag}(B_{ii}). \quad (3.4)$$

We have that

$$[\Delta(X)]_{kk} = [BX - XB]_{kk} + \delta(x_{kk}) = B_{kk}x_{kk} - x_{kk}B_{kk} = 0.$$

i.e.

$$[\Delta(X)]_{kk} = 0, \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (3.5)$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

LEMMA 3.9. $\Delta = 0$.

Proof. Let $X = (x_{ij})$ be an arbitrary element in $M_n(\mathcal{A})$. In the case $i = j$, by Lemma 3.8, we have that $[\Delta(X)]_{ij} = 0$.

For the case $i \neq j$, we fix a pair (i, j) and take the matrix $Y = (y_{rs}) \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$ such that $y_{rs} = x_{rs}$ for all $(r, s) \neq (j, i)$ and $y_{ji} = 1$. Put $Z = \text{diag}(z_k)$, where $z_k = y_{ij} + k1$, $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. By Theorem 2.1, we may choose a derivation $D = D_B + \bar{\delta}$, such that

$$\Delta(Y) = D(Y), \quad \Delta(Z) = D(Z).$$

Since $\Delta(Z) = 0$, it follows that B has the form $B = \text{diag}(B_{ii})$ and $\delta(y_{ij}) = 0$. Then

$$[\Delta(Y)]_{ji} = B_{jj}y_{ji} - y_{ji}B_{ii} + \delta(y_{ji}) = B_{jj} - B_{ii} + \delta(1) = B_{jj} - B_{ii}.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.4, we have that

$$[\Delta(Y)]_{ji} = \delta_{ji}(y_{ji}) = \delta_{ji}(1) = 0.$$

Thus $B_{jj} = B_{ii}$. Since $\delta(y_{ij}) = 0$, it follows that

$$[\Delta(Y)]_{ij} = B_{ii}y_{ij} - y_{ij}B_{jj} + \delta(y_{ij}) = 0,$$

i.e.

$$[\Delta(Y)]_{ij} = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Choose a derivation $D = D_C + \varsigma$ such that

$$\Delta(X) = D(X), \quad \Delta(Y) = D(Y).$$

Then

$$[\Delta(X)]_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^n (C_{is}x_{sj} - x_{is}C_{sj}) + \varsigma(x_{ij})$$

and

$$[\Delta(Y)]_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^n (C_{is}y_{sj} - y_{is}C_{sj}) + \varsigma(y_{ij}).$$

By the construction $x_{rs} = y_{rs}$ for all pairs $(r, s) \neq (j, i)$ and (3.6), we have that

$$[\Delta(X)]_{ij} = [\Delta(Y)]_{ij} = 0.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 3.3] Let $\Delta : M_n(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow M_n(\mathcal{M})$ be a 2-local derivation. By Lemma 3.1, there exists a derivation D such that $(\Delta - D)(E_{ij}) = 0$, for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. By Lemma 3.6, $\delta = (\Delta - D)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a derivation. Consider the

2-local derivation $\Delta_0 = \Delta - D - \bar{\delta}$, then $\Delta_0(E_{ij}) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and $\Delta_0|_{\mathcal{A}} = 0$. By Lemma 3.9, we have that $\Delta_0 = 0$, i.e.

$$\Delta = D + \bar{\delta}.$$

Therefore Δ is a derivation. The proof is complete. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a von Neumann algebra acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Denote by $S(\mathcal{R})$ and $LS(\mathcal{R})$ respectively the sets of all measurable and locally measurable operators affiliated with $\mathcal{R}$. Let τ be a faithful normal semi-finite trace on $\mathcal{R}$, denote by $S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ the set of all τ -measurable operators affiliated with $\mathcal{R}$. The set $LS(\mathcal{R})$ of all locally measurable operators with respect to $\mathcal{R}$ is a unital $*$ -algebra when equipped with the algebraic operations of strong addition and multiplication and taking the adjoint of an operator. The set $S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ of all τ -measurable operators with respect to $\mathcal{R}$ is a solid $*$ -subalgebra in $S(\mathcal{R})$. It is well known that if $\mathcal{R}$ is a finite von Neumann algebra, then $S(\mathcal{R}) = LS(\mathcal{R})$. (see, for example, [1, 27-29])

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a type I_n ($n \geq 2$) von Neumann algebra with the center $\mathcal{Z}$ and τ be a faithful normal semi-finite trace on $\mathcal{R}$. We denote the centers of $S(\mathcal{R})$ and $S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ by $\mathcal{Z}(S(\mathcal{R}))$ and $\mathcal{Z}(S(\mathcal{R}, \tau))$, respectively. By Proposition 1.2 of [1], we have that $\mathcal{Z}(S(\mathcal{R})) = S(\mathcal{Z})$ and $\mathcal{Z}(S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)) = S(\mathcal{Z}, \tau_{\mathcal{Z}})$, where $\tau_{\mathcal{Z}}$ is the restriction of the trace τ on $\mathcal{Z}$. By Propositions 1.4 and 1.5 of [1], $S(\mathcal{R}) \cong M_n(S(\mathcal{Z}))$ and $S(\mathcal{R}, \tau) \cong M_n(S(\mathcal{Z}, \tau_{\mathcal{Z}}))$. It is well known that $\mathcal{R} \cong M_n(\mathcal{Z})$. By Theorem 3.3, we have

COROLLARY 3.10. *Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ is a type $I_n, n \geq 2$, von Neumann algebra and τ is a faithful normal semi-finite trace on $\mathcal{R}$. Then we have that:*

- (1) *every 2-local derivation $\Delta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow LS(\mathcal{R})$ is a derivation;*
- (2) *every 2-local derivation $\Delta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow S(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ is a derivation.*

LEMMA 3.11. *Let $\Delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a 2-local derivation. If there exists a central idempotent e in $\mathcal{A}$ which commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, then $\Delta(ea) = e\Delta(a)$, for each a in $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, by assumption, there exists a derivation $\delta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that: $\Delta(ea) = \delta(ea)$, and $\Delta(a) = \delta(a)$. By assumption, e is a central idempotent in $\mathcal{A}$ commutes with $\mathcal{M}$, it follows that $\delta(e) = 0$. Then

$$\Delta(ea) = \delta(ea) = \delta(e)a + e\delta(a) = e\delta(a) = e\Delta(a).$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.12. *Suppose that $\mathcal{R}$ is a finite von Neumann algebra of type I without abelian direct summands. Then every 2-local derivation $\Delta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow S(\mathcal{R})$ is a derivation.*

Proof. By assumption, $\mathcal{R}$ is a finite von Neumann algebra of type I without abelian direct summands. Then there exists a family $\{P_n\}_{n \in F}$, $F \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus 1$, of orthogonal central projections in $\mathcal{R}$ with $\sum_{n \in F} P_n = 1$, such that the algebra $\mathcal{R}$ is $*$ -isomorphic with the C^* -product of von Neumann algebras $P_n \mathcal{R}$ of type I_n , respectively $n \in F$. Then

$$P_n L S(\mathcal{R}) = P_n S(\mathcal{R}) = S(P_n \mathcal{R}) \cong M_n(P_n Z(\mathcal{R})), \quad n \in F.$$

By Lemma 3.11, we have that $\Delta(P_n A) = P_n \Delta(A)$, for all $A \in \mathcal{R}$ and each $n \in F$. This implies that Δ maps each $P_n \mathcal{R}$ into $P_n S(\mathcal{R})$. For each $n \in F$, we define $\Delta_n : P_n \mathcal{R} \rightarrow P_n S(\mathcal{R})$ by

$$\Delta_n(P_n A) = P_n \Delta(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{R}.$$

By assumption, it follows that Δ_n is a 2-local derivation from $P_n \mathcal{R}$ into $P_n S(\mathcal{R})$ for each $n \in F$. By (1) of Corollary 3.10, we have that Δ_n is a derivation for each $n \in F$. Since $\sum_{n \in F} P_n = 1$, it follows that Δ is a linear mapping. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$, it follows Δ_n is a derivation for each $n \in F$ that

$$\begin{aligned} P_n \Delta(AB) &= \Delta_n(P_n AB) = \Delta_n(P_n A) P_n B + P_n A \Delta_n(P_n B) \\ &= P_n \Delta(A) B + P_n A \Delta(B) \\ &= P_n (\Delta(A) B + A \Delta(B)). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $\sum_{n \in F} P_n = 1$, we get

$$\Delta(AB) = \Delta(A) B + A \Delta(B).$$

Therefore $\Delta : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow S(\mathcal{R})$ is a derivation. The proof is complete. $\square$

Acknowledgement. The authors thank the referee for his or her suggestions. This research was partly supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11371136).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Albeverio, S. Ayupov and K. Kudaybergenov. Structure of derivations on various algebras of measurable operators for type I von Neumann algebras. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 256:2917–2943, 2009.
- [2] S. Albeverio, S. Ayupov, K. Kudaybergenov and B. Nurjanov. Local derivations on algebras of measurable operators. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 13:643–657, 2011.
- [3] R. Alizadeh. Jordan derivations of full matrix algebras. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 430:574–578, 2009.
- [4] G. An and J. Li. Characterizations of linear mappings through zero products or zero Jordan products. *Electron. J. Linear Algebra*, 31:408–424, 2016.

- [5] R. An and J. Hou. Characterizations of derivations on triangular rings: Additive maps derivable at idempotents. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 431:1070–1080, 2009.
- [6] S. Ayupov and K. Kudaybergenov. 2-local derivations and automorphisms on $B(H)$. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 395:15–18, 2012.
- [7] S. Ayupov and K. Kudaybergenov. 2-local derivations on von Neumann algebras. *Positivity*, 19:445–455, 2015.
- [8] S. Ayupov and K. Kudaybergenov. Derivations, local and 2-local derivations on algebras of measurable operators. arXiv:1602.04959v1.
- [9] S. Ayupov, K. Kudaybergenov and A. Alauadinov. 2-local derivations on algebras of locally measurable operators. *Ann. Funct. Anal.*, 4:110–117, 2013.
- [10] S. Ayupov, K. Kudaybergenov and A. Alauadinov. 2-local derivations on matrix algebras over commutative regular algebras. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 439:1294–1311, 2013.
- [11] S. Ayupov and F. Arzikulov. 2-local derivations on matrix rings over associative rings. arXiv:1303.6033v5.
- [12] S. Ayupov and F. Arzikulov. 2-local derivations on algebras of matrix-valued functions on a compact. arXiv:1509.05701v1.
- [13] M. Brešar. Characterizing homomorphisms, derivations and multipliers in rings with idempotents. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*, 137:9–21, 2007.
- [14] E. Christensen. Extensions of derivations II. *Math. Scand.*, 50:111–122, 1982.
- [15] D. Hadwin and J. Li. Local derivations and local automorphisms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 290:702–714, 2003.
- [16] D. Hadwin and J. Li. Local derivations and local automorphisms on some algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, 60:29–44, 2008.
- [17] J. He, J. Li, G. An and W. Huang. Characterizations of 2-local derivations and 2-local Lie derivations on some algebras. arXiv:1611.01632v1.
- [18] B. Johnson. Local derivations on C^* -algebras are derivations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353:313–325, 2001.
- [19] R. Kadison. Local derivations. *J. Algebra*, 130:494–509, 1990.
- [20] S. Kim and J. Kim. Local automorphisms and derivations on M_n . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 132:1389–1392, 2004.
- [21] E. Kirchberg. The derivation problem and the similarity problem are equivalent. *J. Operator Theory*, 36:59–62, 1996.
- [22] D. Larson and A. Sourour. Local derivations and local automorphisms of $B(X)$. *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, 51:187–194, 1990.
- [23] J. Li and Z. Pan. Annihilator-preserving maps, multipliers, and derivations. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 432:5–13, 2010.
- [24] Y. Lin and T. Wong. A note on 2-local maps. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.*, 49:701–708, 2006.
- [25] J. Liu and N. Wong. 2-local automorphisms of operator algebras. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 321:741–750, 2006.
- [26] M. Muratov and V. Chilin. $*$ -algebras of unbounded operators affiliated with a von Neumann algebra. *J. Math. Sci.*, 140:445–451, 2007.
- [27] E. Nelson. Notes on non-commutative integration. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 15:103–116, 1974.
- [28] I. Segal. A non-commutative extension of abstract integration. *Ann. Math.*, 57:401–457, 1953.
- [29] P. Semrl. Local automorphisms and derivations on $B(H)$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 125:2677–2680, 1997.
- [30] P. Semrl. Local automorphisms of standard operator algebras. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 371:303–306, 2010.
- [31] S. Sakai. C^* -algebras and W^* -algebras. *Springer Verlag*, 1971.
- [32] M. Takesaki. Theory of Operator Algebras I. *Springer Verlag*, 1979.